



filed seeking leave to amend, the Plaintiff's Motion is procedurally defective because it fails to comply with Northern District of Texas Local Rule 15.1(a) which governs motions to amend pleadings. The Plaintiff was previously advised by this Court what was required when seeking to amend his complaint. *See* Court's Order dated Dec. 20, 2013 (Doc. No. 41).

It is unclear what other objections, if any, to the Magistrate's Reports and Recommendations are being asserted. It appears that the Plaintiff simply disagrees with the outcome of the Magistrate's rulings, which is an improper ground to invoke *de novo* review. *See, e.g., Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996). "Objections to a magistrate's report must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious. Objections that fail to specify the findings believed to be in error are too general." *See* 12 FED. PRAC. & PROC. CIV. § 3070.1 (2d ed.) § 3070.1 *Practice and Procedure With Regard to Dispositive Motions —Manner and Effect of Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Recommendations* (citing *William J. Lang Land Clearing, Inc. v. Administrator, Wage and Hour Div.*, 520 F. Supp. 2d 870 (E.D. Mich. 2007), *aff'd*, 285 Fed. Appx. 277 (6th Cir. 2008)); *see also id.* ("Party's rambling and sometimes incoherent brief did not constitute 'objection' to magistrate's report. The district court would therefore adopt the magistrate's report in its entirety on the ground that the party made no objection to the report.") (citing *Mercado v. Perez*, 853 F.Supp. 42 (D.C. P.R. 1993).

Even if this Court can discern the objections asserted by the Plaintiff, they should be overruled because the Magistrate properly made Reports and Recommendations that should be affirmed based upon the correct interpretation of the law and the facts.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Defendant Cody Hinders respectfully prays that the Court take notice of the Defendant's position concerning the Plaintiff's requested relief.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matt D. Matzner  
MATT D. MATZNER  
Texas Bar No. 00797022  
CRENSHAW, DUPREE & MILAM, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1499  
Lubbock, Texas 79408  
Telephone: (806) 762-5281  
Facsimile: (806) 762-3510  
*Counsel for Defendant Cody Hinders*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

A true and correct copy of the above and foregoing was on this 19th day of March 2013, served as follows:

**VIA CERTIFIED MAIL, RRR**  
**NO. 7013 2630 0002 0240 1386**

Jimmy F. McHenry, # 1811322  
TDCJ Bill Clements Unit  
9601 Spur 591  
Amarillo, Texas 79107  
*Pro Se Plaintiff*

**VIA ECF**

Lee Ann Reno  
Alex Yarbrough  
Sprouse Shrader Smith, P.C.  
701 S. Taylor St., Ste. 500  
Amarillo, Texas 79101  
*Counsel for Defendants City of Stinnett,  
Officer Drennan Rogers, Officer Patrick  
Lambert, Officer Jeremiah James Massengil,  
and Chief Marie Fabro*

/s/ Matt D. Matzner  
OF COUNSEL